

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/943,209	LAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) _____.

(2) Robert Lord. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 August 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: n/a.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See continuation sheet Note.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Note: Examiner liked to know whether some limitation considered important such as 'iteratively processing' can be further elaborated in the independent claim so to put forth the process of decomposition as perceived as being the crux of the invention. Applicant stated that by specifying one way or another the details of such iterative process would then confine the decomposition step to but one embodiment. Examiner consented with Applicant's representative so as to proceed with the state of the claim as it was presented to effect a subsequent Office Action and amend only the part of claim 1 that would preclude the claim from falling into a impropriety or deficiency in the nature of a the non-statutory matter.